Isospin Quantum Number of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$

Arata Hayashigaki
Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

Kunihiko Terasaki
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

The $D_s^+\pi^0$ and $D_s^{*+}\gamma$ decays of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ are studied by assigning it to various charmed strange scalar mesons. As a result, it is found that its assignment to an iso-triplet four-quark meson is favored by the severest experimental constraint on the ratio of the rates for these decays, while assigning it to an $I = 0$ state (a four-quark or a conventional $\{c\bar{s}\}$) is inconsistent with this constraint.

PACS numbers: PACS number(s) : 14.40.Lb

arXiv:hep-ph/0410393v2 12 Dec 2005

Recently, a narrow $D_s^+\pi^0$ resonance of mass $\simeq 2317$ MeV has been observed [1, 2], and various proposals regarding its assignments have been made [3, 4, 5, 6], including the proposal that it is the ordinary scalar $D_{s0}^{*+} \sim \{c\bar{s}\}$ [7], which is the chiral partner of D_s^+ [8]. However, its isospin quantum number is not yet known definitely, although its neutral and doubly charged partners have not been observed [9]. This is because the observation of different charged states is closely related to their production rates, which are still not known. In addition, if it is assigned to D_{s0}^{*+}, it is not easy to satisfy the severest experimental constraint on the ratio [2],

$$R_{\rm exp} \equiv \left.\frac{\Gamma(D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)}{\Gamma(D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^+\pi^0)}\right|_{\rm exp} < 0.059, \quad (1)$$

as discussed in Refs. [10] and [11]. In particular, the heavy-hadron chiral perturbation theory [12] provides a ratio (of leading order) that is larger by at least a factor of 2 than the upper bound given in Eq. (1), and the result of the next-to-leading order includes too many unknown parameters to give a definite prediction for this ratio. It has also been argued that this ratio would be larger than unity if this resonance were assigned to a DK molecule. In this article, therefore, we study the $D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ and $D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^+\pi^0$ decays rather phenomenologically (without considering the details of models) and demonstrate that Eq. (1) can be easily satisfied if $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is assigned to the iso-triplet scalar four-quark meson, $\hat{F}_I^+ \sim [cn][\bar{s}\bar{n}]_{I=1}\,(n = u, d)$, while it is difficult to reconcile its assignment to an $I = 0$ state (the conventional scalar, $D_{s0}^{*+} \sim \{c\bar{s}\}$, or the scalar four-quark, $\hat{F}_0^+ \sim [cn][\bar{s}\bar{n}]_{I=0}$) with Eq. (1). (For notation of four-quark mesons, see Ref. [6].) The possible existence of such four-quark states has also been suggested for light flavor mesons (the nonet of $[qq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$, $\hat{\delta}^s$, $\hat{\sigma}^s$, $\hat{\sigma}$, $\hat{\kappa}$) [13, 14, 15], which would correspond to the observed light scalar mesons [16], $a_0(980)$, $f_0(980)$, $\sigma(600)$ and $\kappa(800)$ [17], respectively. Therefore, we assign the observed scalar nonet to the $[qq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ nonet, so that we can easily determine the approximate degeneracy between the observed $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$.

If $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is assigned to $\hat{F}_I^+$, its decay into $D_s^+\pi^0$ can proceed through isospin-conserving strong interactions. Therefore, it was naively conjectured that the decay is of the so-called *fall-apart* type and that it has a high rate ($\sim$ 100 MeV or more) [4]. However, this argument is quite naive, as seen below. A four-quark $[qq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ state can be decomposed into a sum of products of $\{q\bar{q}\}$ pairs with different color and spin, and their coefficients are given by the crossing matrices for color and spin [13]. The D_s^+ and π^0 in the decay $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$ are color-less and spin-less, and the corresponding coefficient is much smaller than unity; i.e., the overlap of the wave functions of the initial $\hat{F}_I^+$ and the final $D_s^+\pi^0$ is small. In this way, the narrow width of $\hat{F}_I^+$ can be understood [18, 19] as seen more explicitly below. The rate for a decay $A \to BC$ is given by

$$\Gamma(A \to BC) = \left(\frac{1}{2J_A+1}\right)\left(\frac{q_c}{8\pi m_A^2}\right)\sum_{\rm spin}|M(A \to BC)|^2, \quad (2)$$

where J_A and m_A denote the spin and mass, respectively, of the parent particle A, and q_c the center-of-mass momentum of the final particle. The amplitude for the decay $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$, as an example, can be approximated as

$$M(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0) \simeq \left(\frac{m_{\hat{F}_I}^2 - m_{D_s}^2}{f_{\pi^0}}\right)\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|\hat{F}_I^+\rangle \quad (3)$$

by using a hard pion technique with the PCAC (partially conserved axial-vector current) in the infinite momentum frame (IMF) [20, 21]. The *asymptotic* matrix element of A_π (i.e., the matrix element of A_π between single hadron states with infinite momentum), $\langle B|A_\pi|A\rangle$, gives the dimensionless $AB\pi$ coupling strength. Here, we compare $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$ with $\hat{\delta}^{s+} \to \eta\pi^+$ by using *asymptotic* $SU_f(4)$ symmetry (roughly speaking, the $SU_f(4)$ symmetry of the asymptotic matrix elements). The above-mentioned hard pion technique, the asymptotic flavor symmetry and their important results are reviewed comprehensively in Ref. [21]. The amplitude for $\hat{\delta}^{s+} \to \eta\pi^+$ is obtained by replacing $(\hat{F}_I^+,\ D_s^+,\ \pi^0)$ by $(\hat{\delta}^{s+},\ \eta,\ \pi^+)$ in Eq. (3). The usual η-η' mixing [16]

leads to $\eta = \cos\Theta \cdot \eta^n - \sin\Theta \cdot \eta^s$, where η^n and η^s are the $\{n\bar{n}\}$ and $\{s\bar{s}\}$ components of η, respectively, and $\Theta = \chi + \theta_P$, with $\cos\chi = 1/\sqrt{3}$ and the η-η' mixing angle $\theta_P \simeq -20^\circ$, which implies that the η-η' mixing is far from the ideal one. Because only the η^s component survives in the matrix element $\langle\eta|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle$, due to the OZI rule, we have $\langle\eta|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle = -\sin\Theta \cdot \langle\eta^s|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle$. A *naive* application of the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry yields $\sqrt{2}\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|\hat{F}_I^+\rangle = \langle\eta^s|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle$. This estimation, however, is too naive, since the wave function overlapping in $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$ is small, as seen above, while this is not the case in $\hat{\delta}^{s+} \to \eta\pi^+$, because gluon exchanges in the system, which are more often at a lower energy scale, reshuffle color configurations and spin configurations and cause configuration mixings. As a result, the $\hat{\delta}^{s+} \to \eta\pi^+$ decay would be nearly of the fall-apart type. Therefore, we modify the previously employed asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ relation with asymptotic matrix elements (including four-quark mesons) by introducing the parameter

$$\beta = \frac{\sqrt{2}\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|\hat{F}_I^+\rangle}{\langle\eta^s|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle}. \tag{4}$$

In the naive limit of the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry, we have $\beta = 1$, as seen above. We hereafter refer to the symmetry in the $\beta \neq 1$ case as the *modified* asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry. For simplicity, we consider the limiting case in which there is no configuration mixing for $\hat{F}_I^+$, while there is no suppression arising from the crossing matrices for $\hat{\delta}^{s+}$ (and there is maximum mixing of the color and spin configurations). In this case, we have $|\beta|^2 = \frac{1}{12}$ from the crossing matrices for color and spin [13]. Inserting $|\langle\eta^s|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle| \sim 0.8$ obtained from the tentative value $\Gamma(a_0 \to \eta\pi^+) \simeq 70$ MeV (noting that the measured rate is $50 - 100$ MeV [16]), we obtain

$$\Gamma(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0) \sim 9\,\mathrm{MeV}. \tag{5}$$

Here $a_0(980)$ has been assigned to $\hat{\delta}^s$, and $|\beta|^2 \simeq \frac{1}{12}$ has been assumed. This result seems to be slightly larger than the measured width of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ [16] but still consistent with the data if the $SU_f(4)$ symmetry breaking arising from the overlapping of spatial wavefunctions that was not considered above is taken into account. (Note here that the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry transforming $q \to c$ overestimates the size of the asymptotic matrix elements involving a charmed meson state [19] by $\sim 20 - 30\,\%$.) This suggests that the situation considered above, in which the strong interactions are perturbative at the scale of charm meson mass while they are non-perturbative at a scale $\lesssim 1$ GeV, is approximately realized, at least in the system under consideration here. In this case, the strange quark will be rather slim (with a smaller mass) at the scale of the charm meson mass, as will be briefly discussed later.

When $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is assigned to an $I = 0$ state (the conventional scalar D_{s0}^{*+} or the four-quark $\hat{F}_0^+$), the decay $D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0$ or $\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$ does not conserve isospin. As is well known, isospin violating phenomena (e.g., the difference between d-u quark masses, $\Delta m_\pi = m_{\pi^\pm} - m_{\pi^0}$, $\Delta m_K = m_{K^0} - m_{K^+}$, etc.) have been considered as second-order effects of QED [22], and the isospin non-conserving π^0-η mixing [23, 24] could be of the same origin. (However, this is not assumed in this article.) Therefore, the isospin non-conserving decay $D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0$ or $\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$, which is assumed below to proceed through π^0-η mixing, is conjectured intuitively to be (much) weaker than the radiative decay, in contrast with the results obtained from specific models [12, 25, 26, 27].

Before studying isospin non-conserving decays of D_s^{*+}, D_{s0}^{*+} and $\hat{F}_0^+$, we first investigate their radiative decays under the vector meson dominance (VMD) hypothesis [28] with the flavor $SU_f(4)$ symmetry for the strong vertices and then compare the results with those for the $D_s^+\pi^0$ decays. Because the VMD hypothesis with the ideal ω-ϕ mixing and the flavor $SU_f(3)$ for the strong vertices works fairly well for the radiative decays of light vector mesons [29], we extend it to a system containing charm quarks below. The $V \to P\gamma$ amplitude can be written in the form

$$M(V \to P\gamma) = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} G_{\mu\nu}(V) F_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma) A(V \to P\gamma), \tag{6}$$

where V, P and $A(V \to P\gamma)$ denote a vector meson, a pseudoscalar meson, and the $VP\gamma$ coupling strength, respectively, and $G_{\mu\nu}(V)$ and $F_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma)$ are the field strengths of a vector meson (V) and a photon (γ), respectively. With the VMD hypothesis, $A(V \to P\gamma)$ can be approximated as

$$A(V \to P\gamma) \simeq \sum_{V'=\rho^0,\,\omega,\,\phi,\,\psi} \left[\frac{X_{V'}(0)}{m_{V'}^2}\right] A(V \to PV'), \tag{7}$$

where $A(V \to PV')$ denotes the VPV' coupling strength and $X_V(0)$ is the γV coupling strength on the photon mass shell. (The photon-momentum-square dependence of X_V is studied in Ref. [29].) The values of the quantities $X_V(0)$ have been estimated from analyses of the photoproduction of vector mesons in scattering from various nuclei [30]. For ψ photoproduction, both the measured differential cross section at $t = 0$ and the ψN total cross section estimated from the A dependence of the photoproduction cross sections still have large uncertainties. (Here N denotes a nucleon.) The necessary values of $X_V(0)$ thus obtained using existing data on the photoproduction of vector mesons are as follows: $X_\rho(0) = 0.033 \pm 0.003$ GeV^2, $X_\omega(0) = 0.011 \pm 0.001$ GeV^2, $X_\phi(0) = -0.018 \pm 0.004$ GeV^2 and $X_\psi(0) \sim 0.054$ GeV^2.) [The last value was obtained from $d\sigma(\gamma N \to \psi N)/dt|_{t=0} \simeq 20$ nb/GeV^2 and $\sigma_T(\psi N) = 3.5 \pm 0.8$ mb [31] for the ψN total cross section.] The values of $X_\phi(0)$ and $X_\psi(0)$ are considerably smaller than those of $X_\phi(m_\phi^2)$ and $X_\psi(m_\psi^2)$ estimated from the measured rates for the lepton-pair decays of ϕ and ψ, respectively.

Also, the VPV' coupling strength can be estimated from the measured rate for the $\omega \to \pi^0\gamma$ decay: Setting $(V, P, V') = (\omega, \pi^0, \rho^0)$ in Eq. (7) and inserting the above value of $X_\rho(0)$, we obtain

$$|A(\omega \to \pi^0\rho^0)| \simeq 18\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1} \tag{8}$$

from $\Gamma(\omega \to \pi^0\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 0.734 \pm 0.035$ MeV [16].

To estimate the uncertainties arising from the VMD and the $SU_f(4)$ symmetry for VPV' vertices, we focus on the $D^* \to D\gamma$ decays. The amplitudes $A(D^* \to D\gamma)$ are given by the ρ^0, ω and ψ-meson poles. Using the $SU_f(4)$ relations, $2A(D^{*0} \to D^0\rho^0) = 2A(D^{*0} \to D^0\omega) = \sqrt{2}A(D^{*0} \to D^0\psi) = -2A(D^{*+} \to D^+\rho^0) = 2A(D^{*+} \to D^+\omega) = \sqrt{2}A(D^{*+} \to D^+\psi) = A(\omega \to \pi^0\rho^0)$, and Eq. (8), we obtain $\Gamma(D^{*+} \to D^+\gamma) \sim 2.4$ keV and $\Gamma(D^{*0} \to D^0\gamma) \sim 19$ keV. The former is consistent with $\Gamma(D^{*+} \to D^+\gamma)_{\rm exp} \simeq 1.5$ keV (with $\sim 30\,\%$ uncertainty) if a possible reduction by $\sim 40-60\,\%$ arising from asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry breaking [19] due to the overlapping of spatial wavefunctions is taken into account, as discussed above. This should be done because the VMD hypothesis with the $SU_f(4)$ symmetric VPV' couplings again overestimates the rates for the radiative decays of charm mesons, here by $\sim 40-60\,\%$. The latter is consistent with $\Gamma(D^{*0} \to D^0\gamma)_{\rm exp} < 800$ keV [16]. The large difference between the above two rates results from the fact that the contributions of the ρ^0, ω and ψ meson poles interfere constructively in the latter decay and destructively in the former.

Now we are in a position to consider the $D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma$ decay. We compare the result with that for $D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0$ later. The amplitude is given by ϕ and ψ-meson poles. Using the $SU_f(4)$ symmetry relations, $\sqrt{2}A(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\phi) = \sqrt{2}A(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\psi) = A(\omega \to \pi^0\rho^0)$, and Eq. (8), we obtain a small rate,

$$\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma) \sim 0.8\,\mathrm{keV}, \tag{9}$$

because of the destructive interference between the ϕ and ψ pole amplitudes. However, this result satisfies the experimental constraint, $\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma)_{\rm exp} < 1.8$ MeV [16].

Similarly, the amplitude for the radiative decay of the scalar meson $S \to V\gamma$ can be written in the form

$$M(S \to V\gamma) = G_{\mu\nu}(V)F^{\mu\nu}(\gamma)A(S \to V\gamma), \tag{10}$$

where $S = \hat{F}_I^+$, $\hat{F}_0^+$ or D_{s0}^{*+}. Under the VMD hypothesis, the above $A(S \to V\gamma)$ is given by

$$A(S \to V\gamma) \simeq \sum_{V'=\rho^0,\,\omega,\,\phi,\,\psi} \left[\frac{X_{V'}(0)}{m_{V'}^2}\right] A(S \to VV'). \tag{11}$$

The $SU_f(4)$ relations relevant to $A(S \to VV')$ are

$$\begin{aligned} A(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^{*+}\rho^0) &= A(\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^{*+}\omega) \\ &= A(\phi \to \hat{\delta}^{s0}\rho^0)\beta', \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2A(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\phi) &= 2A(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\psi) \\ &= A(\chi_{c0} \to \psi\psi), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where β' denotes a suppression factor (like β used above) arising from the overlapping of the color and spin wave functions. We again assume that the system under consideration is not very far from the limiting case, i.e., that of full suppression for $A(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^{*+}\rho^0)$ and no suppression for $A(\phi \to \hat{\delta}^{s0}\rho^0)$ (the so-called fall-apart decay). However, the two pairs of quarks $\{q\bar{q}\}$ are now colorless vector states, i.e., $|\beta'|^2 \simeq \frac{1}{4}$ from the crossing matrices for color and spin [13]. For (i) $S = \hat{F}_I^+$, (ii) $S = \hat{F}_0^+$ and (iii) $S = D_{s0}^{*+}$, the amplitude $A(S \to V\gamma)$ is dominated by (i) ρ^0, (ii) ω, and (iii) ϕ and ψ poles, respectively, because of the OZI rule. The input data are $|A(\phi \to \hat{\delta}^{s0}\rho^0)| \simeq 0.020\,\mathrm{MeV}^{-1}$, obtained from $\Gamma(\phi \to a_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 0.32 \pm 0.03$ keV [16], for (i) and (ii), and $|A(\chi_{c0} \to \psi\psi)| \simeq 0.0823\,\mathrm{MeV}^{-1}$, obtained from $\Gamma(\chi_{c0} \to \psi\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 119 \pm 15$ keV [16], for (iii). Inserting Eqs. (11) and (12) or Eqs. (11) and (13) into the amplitude, Eq. (10), and taking the values of the quantities $X_V(0)$ listed above, we estimate the rates for the radiative decays of the scalar mesons listed in Table I. The rate for $\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ is smaller by an order of magnitude than that for $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$, because of the relation $3X_\omega(0) \simeq X_\rho(0)$.

Table I. Estimated rates for the radiative decays of charmed scalar mesons.

Parent(S)	$\hat{F}_I^+$	$\hat{F}_0^+$	D_{s0}^{*+}
Pole(s)	ρ^0	ω	ϕ, ψ
$\Gamma(S \to D_s^+\gamma)$ (keV)	$\simeq 45$	$\simeq 4.7$	~ 35

Therefore, using Eq. (5) and the results listed in Table I, the ratio reads

$$R_{\hat{F}_I} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)}{\Gamma(\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0)} \sim 0.005, \tag{14}$$

which satisfies the constraint given in Eq. (1), as expected.

In the above, we have studied the radiative decays of $\hat{F}_I^+$ and $\hat{F}_0^+$ by taking only $\Gamma(\phi \to a_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 0.32 \pm 0.03$ keV as the input data, although another radiative decay, $\phi \to f_0(980)\gamma$, has also been measured. The reason for this is that the latter is apparently more uncertain than the former. If the measured rate [16] $\Gamma(\phi \to f_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 1.87 \pm 0.09$ keV were taken as the input data, the rate for the $f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma$ under the VMD hypothesis would be given by $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma)_{VMD} \simeq 15$ keV, which is much larger than $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma)_{\rm exp} = 0.39^{+0.10}_{-0.13}$ keV [16]. Also, the ratio $R_{\hat{F}_I}$ would be obtained as $R_{\hat{F}_I} \sim 0.2$ in the same way as in Eq. (14). This implies that the electromagnetic interaction would not be very much weaker than in the case of ordinary strong interactions, and thus it leads to an unnatural result. The above would imply that the input data $\Gamma(\phi \to f_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp}$ is too large. By contrast, if we take $\Gamma(\phi \to a_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp}$, as before, we can accurately reproduce the above $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma)_{\rm exp}$.

Next, we discuss isospin non-conserving decays. The amplitude for $D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0$ is approximately given by

$$M(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0) \simeq \left(\frac{m_{D_s^*}^2 - m_{D_s}^2}{f_{\pi^0}}\right)\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|D_s^{*+}\rangle, \tag{15}$$

as in Eq. (3). Here we have assumed that the violation of isospin conservation is caused by the η-π^0 mixing, i.e., $A_{\pi^0} \to A_{\pi^0} + \epsilon A_\eta$, ($|\epsilon| \ll 1$), and therefore we replace $\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|D_s^{*+}\rangle$ by $\epsilon\langle D_s^+|A_\eta|D_s^{*+}\rangle$. The axial charge A_η is given by $A_\eta = \cos\Theta\cdot A_{\eta^n} - \sin\Theta\cdot A_{\eta^s}$, where A_{η^n} and A_{η^s} are the $\{n\bar{n}\}$ and $\{s\bar{s}\}$ components of A_η, respectively. In the asymptotic matrix element of A_η, only the matrix element of A_{η^s} can survive, due to the OZI rule, and the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry leads to $\langle D_s^+|A_{\eta^s}|D_s^{*+}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle\pi^+|A_{\pi^+}|\rho^0\rangle$. Therefore, it follows that

$$2\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|D_s^{*+}\rangle = -\epsilon\sin\Theta\cdot\langle\pi^+|A_{\pi^+}|\rho^0\rangle. \tag{16}$$

The size of $\langle\pi^+|A_{\pi^+}|\rho^0\rangle$ can be estimated as $|\langle\pi^+|A_{\pi^+}|\rho^0\rangle| \simeq 1.0$ [20] from the measured rate, $\Gamma(\rho \to \pi\pi)_{\rm exp} \simeq 150$ MeV [16]. Inserting Eq. (16) with $\Theta \simeq 35^\circ$ ($\theta_P \simeq -20^\circ$), as before, into Eq. (15) and using the measured branching ratios for the $D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0$ and $D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma$ decays [16], we get

$$|\epsilon| \sim 1.0 \times 10^{-2}, \tag{17}$$

where we have used Eq. (9). This value of $|\epsilon|$ is consistent with the result given in Ref. [23] and with the second-order effect of QED, as argued qualitatively above.

With the help of the above value of $|\epsilon|$, we finally consider two cases of the isospin non-conserving decay, $D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^+\pi^0$: (a) assuming $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is the scalar four-quark $\hat{F}_0^+ \sim [cn][\bar{s}\bar{n}]_{I=0}$, and (b) assuming $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is the conventional scalar $D_{s0}^{*+} \sim \{c\bar{s}\}$. The amplitude for the S^+ ($= \hat{F}_0^+$ or D_{s0}^{*+}) $\to D_s^+\pi^0$ decay can be approximated as

$$M(S^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0) \simeq \left(\frac{m_S^2 - m_{D_s}^2}{f_{\pi^0}}\right)\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|S^+\rangle, \tag{18}$$

as in Eq. (3). Because such a decay is assumed to proceed through the π^0-η mixing, as discussed above, we replace the matrix elements $\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|\hat{F}_0^+\rangle$ and $\langle D_s^+|A_{\pi^0}|D_{s0}^{*+}\rangle$ by the OZI-allowed matrix elements $\epsilon\cos\Theta\cdot\langle D_s^+|A_{\eta^n}|\hat{F}_0^+\rangle$ and $-\epsilon\sin\Theta\cdot\langle D_s^+|A_{\eta^s}|D_{s0}^{*+}\rangle$, respectively.

In the case (a), the modified asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry leads to $2\langle D_s^+|A_{\eta^n}|\hat{F}_0^+\rangle = \langle\pi^+|A_{\eta^s}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle\beta$. Then, taking $|\beta|^2 \simeq \frac{1}{12}$ and $|\sqrt{2}\langle\pi^+|A_{\eta^s}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle| = |\langle\eta^s|A_{\pi^-}|\hat{\delta}^{s+}\rangle| \sim 0.8$, estimated above, we obtain

$$\Gamma(\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0) \sim 0.7 \text{ keV}, \tag{19}$$

which is again smaller than $\Gamma(\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma) \simeq 4.7$ keV, listed in Table I. However, the ratio of the decay rates,

$$R_{\hat{F}_0} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)}{\Gamma(\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0)} \sim 7, \tag{20}$$

is still much larger than the experimental upper bound appearing in Eq. (1), although it is much smaller than that conjectured intuitively. This is because the radiative $\hat{F}_0^+ \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ decay is suppressed due to the small $\gamma\omega$ coupling.

In the case (b), the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry leads to $\langle D_s^+|A_{\eta^s}|D_{s0}^{*+}\rangle = \langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle$. The size of the right-hand side is estimated to be $|\langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle| \simeq 0.29$ from the experimental result $\Gamma(K_0^{*0} \to K^+\pi^-)_{\rm exp} = 182 \pm 24$ MeV [16]. Here we have assumed that $K_0^*(1430)$ is the conventional ${}^3P_0\,\{d\bar{s}\}$ state [16]. Using the above result for the asymptotic matrix elements, the value of $|\epsilon|$ in Eq. (17), and $\theta_P = -20^\circ$, we have

$$\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0) \sim 0.6 \text{ keV}, \tag{21}$$

which is much smaller than the other estimates [11, 12, 25, 26, 27, 32]. In this case, the ratio of the rate for the radiative decay (listed in Table I) to the isospin non-conserving rate is given by

$$R_{D_{s0}^*} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)}{\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*} \to D_s^{+}\pi^0)} \sim 60, \tag{22}$$

as conjectured intuitively. This value is again much larger than the experimental upper limit given in Eq. (1). It is quite natural that $R_{\hat{F}_0}$ and $R_{D_{s0}^*}$ in Eqs. (20) and (22) are much larger than unity, as the rates for isospin non-conserving decays are proportional to $|\epsilon|^2 = O(\alpha^2)$, as discussed above, while those for the radiative decays are proportional to α, where α denotes the fine structure constant.

We now discuss other models [11, 12, 25, 26, 27], in which $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ has been assigned to the chiral partner of D_s^+ (or ${}^3P_0\,\{c\bar{s}\}$). Although those models predict much smaller values of the ratio $R_{D_{s0}^*}$ than our result, given in Eq. (22), most of them are still larger than the experimental upper bound given in Eq. (1). In Ref. [27], for example, the small ratio $R_{D_{s0}^*} \simeq 0.08$ is obtained. This is quite near the experimental upper bound appearing in Eq. (1), but it is still a little larger. In this model, the estimated rate for the $D_{s0}^* \to D_s^+\pi^0$ decay is $\Gamma(D_{s0}^* \to D_s^+\pi^0)_{\rm BEH} \simeq 21.5$ keV, which is considerably larger than the other estimates ($\sim 5 - 10$ keV) [11, 12, 25, 32]. If the value of the unknown parameter needed to obtain this rate is employed, the width of the non-strange partner, $D_0^* \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$, of D_{s0}^* is predicted to be around 500 MeV [27]. However, this value is much larger than the measured widths ($\sim 240 - 280$ MeV) of the broad bumps that have been observed in the $D^0\pi^+$ and $D^+\pi^-$ invariant mass distributions [33, 34] and have been interpreted as peaks arising from the scalar resonances D_0^*. In addition, the widths of the resonances D_0^* might be narrower. Specifically, the argument [19] has been given that these bumps have a structure containing two scalar resonances; one is the conventional D_0^* with a width $\sim 50 - 90$ MeV, and the other is the four-quark $\hat{D} \sim [cn][\bar{u}\bar{d}]$ with a width $\sim 7 - 15$ MeV. Therefore, the value $\Gamma(D_{s0}^* \to D_s^+\pi^0) \simeq 21.5$ keV seems to be too large.

For the radiative $D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ decay, the model [27] predicts $\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)_{\rm BEH} \simeq 1.74$ keV, which is not very far from the other predictions [11, 12, 25, 26]. In the model, however, the rate for the radiative decay is very sensitive to the assumed values of the constituent quark masses. The above small rate has been obtained by choosing $m_c \simeq 3m_s$, which is very far from the picture of the heavy charm quark. In addition, there is an argument based on a semi-relativistic potential model [35] that $m_c \simeq 1.4 - 1.5$ GeV and $m_s \simeq 0.090 - 0.095$ GeV near the scale of the charm meson mass under consideration. Such a small value of m_s might be supported by recent lattice QCD analyses [36]. Moreover, the model predicts

$$\left.\frac{\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0)}{\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma)}\right|_{\rm BEH} \simeq 0.018, \tag{23}$$

in the case that parameter values yielding $\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\gamma)_{\rm BEH} \simeq 1.74$ keV are used. The above ratio is much smaller than the the well-known experimental value [16],

$$\left.\frac{\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0)}{\Gamma(D_s^{*+} \to D_s^+\gamma)}\right|_{\rm exp} = 0.062 \pm 0.026. \tag{24}$$

The model studied in Ref. [26] predicts a small rate for the $D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ decay that is consistent with the result discussed above. It also predicts a large rate,

$$\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+} \to D_s^+\pi^0) \simeq 129 \text{ keV}, \tag{25}$$

in the case that a large value is used for the isospin violating parameter, $\epsilon_{AG} \simeq 4.0 \times 10^{-2}$, which has been estimated by using the measured branching ratios for the OZI violating decays [16], $B(J/\psi(2S) \to J/\psi(1S)\pi^0) = (9.6 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{-4}$ and $B(J/\psi(2S) \to J/\psi(1S)\eta) = (3.17 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-2}$. As a consequence, a small ratio, $R_{D_{s0}^*} \leq 0.015$, which satisfies Eq. (1) has been obtained. However, the above value of ϵ_{AG} is much larger than the value of $|\epsilon|$ that we estimated from the measured ratio in Eq. (24). This seems to imply that the mechanism of the isospin violation discussed above is different from the usual π^0-η mixing. For this reason, the model studied in Ref. [26] cannot reproduce Eq. (24). We conclude that it is difficult to satisfy the experimental constraint given in Eq. (1) while simultaneously realizing consistency with the well-known ratio Eq. (24) if $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ is assigned to an $I = 0$ state.

In summary, we have studied the $D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^{*+}\gamma$ and $D_{s0}^+(2317) \to D_s^+\pi^0$ decays using the VMD hypothesis, the hard pion technique in the IMF, and the (asymptotic) $SU_f(4)$. We used the measured rates of $\Gamma(\chi_{c0} \to \psi\gamma)_{\rm exp}$ and $\Gamma(\phi \to a_0(980)\gamma)_{\rm exp}$ as the input data, although the assignment of $a_0(980)$ to the iso-triplet four-quark meson, $\hat{\delta}^s$, has not yet been confirmed; i.e., it might contain some other configuration, like a $K\bar{K}$ molecule [37]. We have also checked ambiguities arising from the above approximations by comparing our results for $D^* \to D\gamma$ (and $D^* \to D\pi$ in Ref. [19]) with existing experimental data. In this way, we have observed the followings. (i) The assignment of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ to the iso-triplet four-quark meson, $\hat{F}_I^+ \sim [cn][\bar{s}\bar{n}]_{I=1}$, is consistent with the experimental constraint, Eq. (1), as seen in Eq. (14). (ii) It is difficult to reconcile the assignment of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ to an iso-singlet meson (the four-quark $\hat{F}_0^+$ or the conventional D_{s0}^{*+}) with Eqs. (1) and (24) simultaneously. This is quite natural, because the rates for the isospin non-conserving decays are proportional to $|\epsilon|^2 = O(\alpha^2)$, while those for the radiative decays are proportional to α, the fine structure constant. Thus, it is seen that the assignment of $D_{s0}^+(2317)$ to $\hat{F}_I^+$ is most reasonable. In addition, this assignment is compatible with the observation that the estimated branching fraction for $B \to \bar{D}D_{sJ}^+$ would be consistent with the measured value if the D_{sJ}^+ are interpreted as four-quark mesons, while it would be much larger than the measured one if the D_{sJ}^+ are interpreted as the conventional $\{c\bar{s}\}$ [10]. The remaining problem is that neutral and doubly charged partners of $\hat{F}_I^+$ have not yet been observed [9]. To solve this problem, we need to know the production mechanism of the $\hat{F}_I^{0,+,++}$ mesons. Determining this mechanism is left as a future project. (iii) Finally, the numerical results obtained in this work should not be interpreted too strictly, because our theoretical framework may result in a total overestimate of $\sim 40 - 60\,\%$ in the rate. Even considering this ambiguity, however, the conclusion of the present work is not changed.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank K. Abe and K. Hagiwara of KEK for informing them of the status of experiments on the isospin of D_{s0}^+. One of the authors (K. T.) would like to thank T. Onogi of YITP for discussions and the members of the nuclear theory groups of the Tokyo Institute of Technology and Kyoto University for discussions and comments. The research of A. H. is supported by a research fellowship from the Department of Physics, Kyoto University. This work of K. T. is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Science Research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan (Nos. 13135101 and 16540243).

[1] B. Aubert et al. (the BABAR Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003), 242001.
P. Krokovny et al. (the BELLE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003), 262002.

[2] D. Besson et al. (the CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 032002.

[3] T. Barnes, F. E. Close and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 054006.

[4] H.-Y. Cheng and W.-S. Hou, Phys. Lett. B **566** (2003), 193.

[5] S. Nussinov, hep-ph/0306187.
A. P. Szczepaniak, Phys. Lett. B **567** (2003), 23.
T. E. Browder, S. Pakvasa and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Lett. B **578** (2004), 365.
E. E. Kolomeitzev and M. F. M. Lutz, Phys. Lett. B **582** (2004), 39.
E. van Beveren and G. Rupp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003), 012003.
J. Hofmann and M. F. M. Lutz, Nucl. Phys. A **733** (2004), 142.

[6] K. Terasaki, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 011501(R).

[7] A. De Rújura, H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976), 785.

[8] M. A. Nowak, M. Rho and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993), 4370.
W. A. Bardeen and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994), 409.

[9] B. Aubert et al. (the BABAR Collaboration), hep-ex/0408067.

[10] J. Wang, hep-ex/0312039.

[11] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio and R. Ferrandes, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19** (2004), 2083.

[12] T. Mehen and R. P. Springer, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004), 074014.

[13] R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977), 267; *ibid.* **15** (1977), 281.

[14] N. N. Achasov and V. N. Ivanchenko, Nucl. Phys. B **315** (1989), 465.

[15] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004), 212002.

[16] S. Eidelman et al. (the Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **592** (2004), 1.

[17] E. M. Aitala et al. (the E791 collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002), 121801.

[18] K. Terasaki, Soryushiron Kenkyu (Kyoto) **108** (2004) , F11; hep-ph/0309119; AIP Conf. Proc. **717** (2004), 556; hep-ph/0309279.

[19] K. Terasaki, hep-ph/0405146; K. Terasaki and Bruce H J McKellar, Prog. Theor. Phys. **114** (2005), 205.

[20] K. Terasaki, S. Oneda and T. Tanuma, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984), 456.

[21] S. Oneda and K. Terasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. No. 82 (1985), 1, and references therein.

[22] F. E. Close, *An Introduction to Quarks and Partons* (Academic, New York, 1979).

[23] R. H. Dalitz and F. von Hippel, Phys. Lett. **10** (1964), 153.

[24] P. Cho and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994), 6228.

[25] S. Godfrey, Phys. Lett. B **568** (2003), 254.
P. Colangelo and F. De Fazio, Phys. Lett. B **570** (2003), 180.

[26] Ya. I. Azimov and K. Goeke, Eur. Phys. J. A **21** (2004), 501; hep-ph/0403082.

[27] W. A. Bardeen, E. J. Eichten and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003), 054024.

[28] See, for example, J. J. Sakurai, *Currents and Mesons* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969), and references therein.

[29] K. Terasaki, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **31** (1981), 457; Nuovo Cim. **66A** (1981), 475. The data used in these papers now should be updated. It also should be noted that the $SU_f(3)$ for the VPV' couplings might overestimate the rates for the $K^* \to K\gamma$ decays, by ~ 20 per cent.

[30] D. W. G. S. Leith, *Electromagnetic Interactions of Hadrons*, ed. A. Donnachie and G. Shaw (Plenum Press, New York, 1978), p. 345.

[31] S. D. Holmes, W. Lee and J. E. Wiss, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **35** (1985), 397.

[32] M. Harada, M. Rho and C. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2004), 074002.

[33] K. Abe et al. (the BELLE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004), 112002.

[34] E. W. Vaandering (the FOCUS Collaboration), hep-ex/0406044.

[35] T. Matsuki and T. Morii, Phys. Rev. D **56**(1997), 5646.
T. Matsuki, K. Mawatari, T. Morii and K. Sudoh, Phys. Lett. B **606** (2005), 329.

[36] R. Gupta, hep-lat/0502005.

[37] F. E. Close, N. Isgur and S. Kumano, Nucl. Phys. B **389** (1993), 513.